REMARKS

Request for Reconsideration, Informal Matters, Claims Pending

The application stands subject to a non-final Office action mailed on 25 February 2008. Reconsideration of the claimed invention in view of the amendments above and the discussion below is respectfully requested.

The claims were recast as device claims.

Claims 1 and 3-23 are pending.

Arguments re: Jokinen

Rejection Summary

Claims 19-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) for anticipation by U.S. Patent No. 5,570,369 (Jokinen).

Discussion of Claim 19

Regarding Claim 19, Jokinen fails to disclose a

> … mobile wireless communication device capable of receiving an incoming message transmitted in a series of portions over successive intervals, comprising:
> a receiver;
> a controller coupled to the receiver,
> the controller configured to cause the receiver to receive portions of an incoming message in at least two successive intervals without receiving a portion of the incoming message in a first of the successive intervals;

the controller configured to decode the portions of the incoming message received.

At col. 6, lines 28-31, Jokinen discloses receiving only 2 or 3 of 4 time slots and attempting to reconstruct a message from bits in received time slots. If the message cannot be re-constructed, Jokinen receives additional time slots. At col. 6, lines 49-68, Jokinen discloses establishing a threshold (based on SNR) for determining the likelihood that the message could be re-constructed from the bits in only 2 or 3 of the 4 time slots. At col. 6, lines 54-57, Jokinen discloses simulating the 2nd and 3rd time slots of a 4 time slot message to obtain a range of SNR values suitable for the threshold. Contrary to the Examiner's assertion, Jokinen does not disclose receiving portions of an incoming message in at least two successive intervals "... without receiving a portion of the incoming message in a first of the successive intervals...." Claim 19 is thus patentably distinguished over Jokinen.

Arguments re: Massingill & Kalveram

Rejection Summary

Claims 1, 3-4, 6-8, 10-13, 16 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,978,366 (Massingill) in view of U.S. Publication No. 2001/0023184 (Kalveram).

Discussion of Claim 1

Regarding Claim 1, Massingill and Kalveram fail to suggest a

> ... mobile wireless communication device, comprising:
> a receiver;
> a controller coupled to the receiver,
> the controller configured to cause the receiver to receive not more than one burst of an incoming paging message transmitted in a series of bursts over successive time frames,
> the controller configured to determine whether the incoming paging message corresponds to a known paging message by comparing incoming data of the not more than one received burst with known data of a corresponding burst of the known paging message,
> the controller configured to combine the incoming data with known data of a different burst of the known paging message only if results of comparing satisfy a specified requirement.

The Examiner's assertion that Massingill combines the incoming data with known date is erroneous. At col. 8, line 55 – col. 9, 18, Massingill discloses comparing a portion of a current broadcast message with a previously received broadcast message to determine whether it is necessary to completely receive the current broadcast message. At col. 11, lines 1-2, Massingill discloses receiving as many time slots of the broadcast message as are necessary to decode the portion used for the comparison. Thus there is no reason for Massingill to combine incoming data with known data.

The Examiner concedes that Massingill fails to disclose receiving not more than one burst of a message transmitted in a series of bursts over successive intervals. Kalveram however does not remedy this admitted deficiency. Kalveram discloses comparing channel coded bits in a first received burst with a stored sample to determine whether the remaining bits must be received. Kalveram discloses receiving the remaining bursts if there is no match with the sample. It a match exists, Kalveram discloses powering OFF the receiver wherein the remaining bursts are not received. Neither Massingill nor Kalveram disclose or suggest receiving not more than one burst

of a message transmitted in a series of bursts and combining the incoming data of the received burst with known data of a different burst of the known paging message. Claim 1 is thus patentably distinguished over Massingill and Kalveram.

Discussion of Claim 10

Regarding Claim 10, Massingill and Kalveram fail to suggest a

> … mobile wireless communication device, comprising:
> a receiver;
> a controller communicably coupled to the receiver, the controller configured to
> cause the receiver to receive not more than one burst of an incoming paging message transmitted in a series of bursts over successive intervals,
> combine the portion of the incoming message with a portion of a known message, and
> reconstruct a message from the portion of the incoming message and the portion of the known message.

The Examiner's assertion that Massingill combines the incoming data with known date is erroneous. At col. 8, line 55 – col. 9, 18, Massingill discloses comparing a portion of a current broadcast message with a previously received broadcast message to determine whether it is necessary to completely receive the current broadcast message. At col. 11, lines 1-2, Massingill discloses receiving as many time slots of the broadcast message as are necessary to decode the portion used for the comparison. Thus there is no reason for Massingill to combine incoming data with known data.

The Examiner concedes that Massingill fails to disclose receiving not more than one burst of a message transmitted in a series of bursts over

successive intervals. Kalveram however does not remedy this admitted deficiency. Kalveram discloses comparing channel coded bits in a first received burst with a stored sample to determine whether the remaining bits must be received. Kalveram discloses receiving the remaining bursts only if there is no match with the sample. It a match exists, Kalveram discloses powering OFF the receiver wherein the remaining bursts are not received. Neither Massingill nor Kalveram disclose or suggest receiving not more than one burst of a message transmitted in a series of bursts and combining the incoming data of the received burst with known data of a different burst of the known paging message. Claim 10 is thus patentably distinguished over Massingill and Kalveram.

Prayer For Relief

In view of the discussion above and the attached certified copy of the priority document, the Claims of the present application are in condition for allowance. Kindly withdraw any rejections and objections and allow this application to issue as a United States Patent without further delay.

Respectfully submitted,

/ ROLAND K. BOWLER II /

ROLAND K. BOWLER II 22 MAY 2008
REG. NO. 33,477

MOTOROLA, INC.
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPT. (RKB)
600 NORTH U.S. HIGHWAY 45, W4-37Q
LIBERTYVILLE, ILLINOIS 60048

TELEPHONE NO. (847) 523-3978
FACSIMILE NO. (847) 523-2350